



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/705,148	11/01/2000	Geetha Ravishankar	CISP669	4572
26541	7590	06/14/2004	EXAMINER	
RITTER, LANG & KAPLAN 12930 SARATOGA AE. SUITE D1 SARATOGA, CA 95070			CHANG, JUNGWON	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2154	6

DATE MAILED: 06/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/705,148

Applicant(s)

RAVISHANKAR ET AL.

Examiner

Jungwon Chang

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

## A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 March 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-22 are presented for examination.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- a. The claim language in the following claims is not clearly understood:
  - i. As to claim 1, line 4, it is uncertain whether the application refers to a network application in line 1.
  - ii. Line 5, it is uncertain whether the directory server refers to directory servers in line 4 (i.e., is the directory server intended to mean one of the directory servers?).
  - iii. As to claims 10, 14 and 19, they have the same deficiency as claim 1 as set forth in the paragraph above.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 19, 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Byrne et al. (US 6,484,177).

6. As to claim 19, Byrne discloses the invention as claimed including a system for integrating a network application (i.e., application; col. 1, lines 36-39) with different directory servers (col. 1, lines 16-26), the system comprising:

a table mapping attributes utilized by the network application (i.e., application; col. 1, lines 36-39) with attribute names used by the directory servers available to the application (col. 6, lines 21-24 and 28-31);

means for identifying in the table the directory server attribute name corresponding to an attribute requested by the application (i.e., identifying the directory server which stores the corresponding to the requested attribute; col. 2, lines 5-10 and 62-67; col. 6, lines 15-28); and

means for searching (i.e., query) the directory server for the requested attribute with the identified directory server attribute name (col. 2, lines 18-19 and 54-59; col. 12, lines 15-20).

7. As to claim 21, Byrne discloses the application is a unified communication

application (col. 7, lines 61-67).

8. As to claim 22, Byrne discloses searching the directory server includes using LDAP (i.e., LDAP search request; col. 1, lines 36-39; col. 2, lines 18-19 and 54-59).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 1-18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Byrne et al. (US 6,708,170) hereinafter Byrne, in view of Van Huben et al. (US 6,484,177), hereinafter Van Huben.

11. As to claim 14, Byrne discloses the invention substantially as claimed including a system for integrating a network application (i.e., application; col. 1, lines 36-39) with different directory servers (col. 1, lines 16-26), the system comprising:

a table mapping attributes utilized by the network application (i.e., application; col. 1, lines 36-39) with attribute names used by the directory servers (col. 6, lines 21-24 and 28-31);

memory (col. 4, lines 17-20, 32-36 and 43-47) that at least temporarily stores the table (i.e., storing the table in the cache; col. 5, lines 49-51; col. 6, lines 28-31); and a processor (i.e., processor; 202, fig. 2; col. 4, lines 17-20 and 37-43) that identifies in the table the directory server attribute name corresponding to an attribute requested by the application (i.e., identifying the directory server which stores the corresponding to the requested attribute; col. 2, lines 5-10 and 62-67; col. 12, lines 15-20).

12. Byrne discloses a directory server having the mapping table can send a request (i.e., query, 420, fig. 4A) to other directory servers (col. 6, lines 14-23). However, Byrne does not specifically disclose sending a request containing the identified directory server attribute name to the corresponding directory server. Van Huben discloses sending a request containing the identified directory server attribute name to the corresponding directory server (i.e., sending the query the identified attribute name to the directory server; col. 14, lines 34-38; col. 15, lines 11-14; col. 17, lines 12-22). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Byrne and Van Huben because Van Huben's sending the request to the corresponding directory server would allow the user to receive the desired information from the directory server.

13. As to claim 15, Byrne discloses the application is a unified communication application (col. 7, lines 61-67).

14. As to claim 16, Byrne discloses the processor is configured to send the request to an LDAP server (col. 2, lines 5-9).

15. As to claim 17, Byrne discloses the application is configured to communicate with a message server (i.e., email server; col. 1, lines 36-39).

16. As to claim 18, Byrne does not specifically disclose the application is configured for communicating with a SNPP API. However, Van Huben discloses the application is configured for communicating with a SNPP API (i.e., Simple Network Paging Protocol Application Program Interface; pager, col. 4, line 64 – col. 5, line 7; col. 5, lines 18-20). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Byrne and Van Huben because Van Huben's SNPP would allow the user to send alphanumeric message to the pager and cellular phone via network.

17. As to claim 1, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 14 above. In addition, Byrne discloses receiving information in response to the request (i.e., responses, 422, fig. 4A; col. 6, lines 19-20).

18. As to claim 4, Byrne discloses the number of different directory servers is greater than two (i.e., Server1-Server3; fig. 4).

19. As to claim 5, Byrne discloses running an IP based software (i.e., IP; col. 1, lines 40-42; col. 3, lines 60-62; col. 10, lines 8-10).

20. As to claim 6, Byrne discloses sending a search request (col. 2, lines 18-19 and 54-59).

21. As to claim 7, Byrne discloses sending a messaging request (i.e., email or written query; col. 1, lines 36-39; col. 2, lines 18-19 and 54-59).

22. As to claim 8, Byrne discloses loading the table into memory when the application is run (i.e., storing the table in the cache; col. 5, lines 49-51; col. 6, lines 28-31).

23. As to claim 9, Byrne does not specifically disclose providing meta-data specifying the directory servers available to the application. However, Van Huben discloses providing meta-data specifying the directory servers available to the application (col. 6, lines 31-34; col. 7, lines 51-52; col. 20, line 55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Byrne and Van Huben because Van Huben's metadata would provide the information that used to keep tracking of the application.

24. As to claim 10, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 14 above. In



addition, Byrne discloses computer program product (i.e., program instruction; col. 4, lines 11-14 and 43-47); code that receives information in response to the request (i.e., responses, 422, fig. 4A; col. 6, lines 19-20); and a computer readable medium that stores the computer codes (col. 4, lines 17-20, 32-36 and 43-47; col. 12, lines 59-67).

25. As to claim 13, Byrne discloses the computer readable medium is selected from the group consisting of CD-ROM, floppy disk, tape, flash memory, system memory, hard drive (col. 4, lines 17-20, 32-36 and 43-47).

26. As to claim 2, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 15 above.

27. As to claim 3, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 16 above.

28. As to claim 11, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 9 above.

29. As to claim 12, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 8 above.

30. As to claim 20, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 1 and 10 above.

***Conclusion***

31. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Garrison et al, patent 6,714,930, Leung et al, patent 6,154,743, Chan et al, patent 6,360,230, Tuatini, US 2002/0010781 disclose method and system for accessing heterogeneous directory services.

Ralph E. Droms, "Access to Heterogeneous Directory Services", IEEE, June 1990, pages 1054-1061.

32. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jungwon Chang whose telephone number is (703)305-9669. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00 (Monday-Friday).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A Follansbee can be reached on (703)305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.


Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

Application/Control Number: 09/705,148  
Art Unit: 2154

Page 10

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic  
Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jungwon Chang  
June 7, 2004



JOHN FOLLANSBEE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100